

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in the above-referenced patent application. Claims 1-10 have been amended, claims 11-26 have been added and no claims have canceled. It is respectfully submitted that adequate support for new claims 11-26 may be found in the specification. For example, support may be found at least from paragraph [0011] to paragraph [0013] and Figure 1.

In the Office Action, dated August 23rd, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiedenman et al (U.S. Patent No. 4,334,287, hereinafter "Wiedenman") in view of So et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,307,776, hereinafter, "So"); and rejected claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keeth et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,445,636, hereinafter "Keeth"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

It is noted that in order to establish *prima facie* obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify or combine reference teachings, and the modification or combination, if successful, must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. As stated in the Manual for Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), § 2142/2143, "To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure." For example, neither Wiedenman nor So teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, as set forth in MPEP § 2142/2143, and the Examiner has made no showing that all of the claim limitations are present in Wiedenman or So.

Assignee begins with claim 1. Assignee respectfully submits that claim 1, as amended, is not rendered obvious by Wiedenman in view of So. It is respectfully submitted that Wiedenman, whether viewed alone or in combination with So, does not show or describe at least "a scanner memory having

a plurality of memory pins; a control processing unit having a plurality of data pins, wherein at least one of the plurality of data pins is coupled to at least one of the plurality of memory pins; and a buffer, coupled to at least one of the plurality of data pins, wherein the buffer is adapted to provide data signals to the at least one of the plurality of data pins according to a control signal synchronized with a recharging signal provided to the scanner memory.” As recited in claim 1, as amended. Wiedenman is directed to a buffer memory arrangement, but does not include at least a buffer having the limitations recited in claim 1, as amended.

The Examiner concedes that Wiedenman is lacking at least one element of claim 1. As stated in the Office Action, page 2, “Wiedenman et al do not teach expressly the buffer receiving and feeding the input signal into the control-processing unit according to a control signal synchronized with the recharging signal”. Additionally, So fails to cure this deficiency noted by the Examiner. In the cited portions of So, arbitration logic temporarily stores input data in a buffer while a memory is being refreshed, and after a refresh operation is complete, controls a multiplexer to write the data from a buffer to an address. (col 10:14 – col 10:17). So does not teach or suggest a “control processing unit”, or “the buffer is adapted to provide data signals to the at least one of the plurality of data pins according to a control signal synchronized with a recharging signal provided to the scanner memory.” As recited in claim 1, as amended. Therefore, because neither of Weidenman nor So teach or suggest at least, all of the claim limitations as set forth in MPEP § 2142/2143 are not present, and a successful 35 U.S.C 103(a) rejection has not been made. It is, therefore, respectfully submitted that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Additionally, claims 2-10, as amended, either depend from or include limitations similar to claim 1, as amended, and these claims are in a condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as those presented above in support of claim 1, as amended.

Additionally, Assignee respectfully submits that claims 1 and 6, as amended, are not rendered obvious by Keeth. Referring now to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Keeth does not show or describe at least “wherein the buffer is adapted to provide data signals to the at least one of the plurality of data pins according to a control signal synchronized with a recharging signal provided to the scanner memory.” As recited in claim 1, as amended. Keeth is directed to a method of refreshing

DRAM memory, and does not address providing data between a buffer and a control processing unit. As stated from col 3:65 – col 4:2, “For a read access, one of the arrays, e.g. array 12a, can be considered a primary array from which the data will be read if the array 12a is not being refreshed. If the array 12a is being refreshed, then data can be read from the array 12b, which is then considered to be a secondary array” Keeth does not teach or suggest at least “the buffer is adapted to provide data signals to the at least one of the plurality of data pins according to a control signal synchronized with a recharging signal provided to the scanner memory.” As recited in claim 1, as amended. Therefore, because all of the claim limitations as set forth in MPEP § 2142/2143 are not present, and a successful 35 U.S.C 103(a) rejection has not been made. It is, therefore, respectfully submitted that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Additionally, claim 6 includes limitations similar to claim 1, as amended, and this claim is in a condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as those presented above in support of claim 1, as amended.

Assignee respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons presented above, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established, and, therefore, claims 1-10, as amended, is in a condition for allowance. It is noted that many other bases for traversing the rejection could be provided, but Assignee believes that this ground is sufficient. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw his rejections of these claims.

Additionally, new claims 11-26 are in a condition for allowance for the same and/or similar reasons as presented above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims pending in this patent application, as amended, are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, she is invited to contact the undersigned at (503) 439-6500. Reconsideration of this patent application and early allowance of all the claims is respectfully requested.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges of any fees required for this submission to Deposit Account number 50-3703.

Dated: _____

1/20/06

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Willardson
Patent Attorney
Reg. No. 50,856

Berkeley Law and Technology Group, LLC
1700 NW 167th Place, Suite 240
Beaverton, OR 97006